

A
R E P L Y
TO THE
REASONS
OF THE
Oxford-Clergy
AGAINST
ADDRESSING

Publish'd with Allowance.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Most
Excellent Majesty for His Household and
Chappel. 1687.

175

176

A

R E P L Y

T O T H E

R E A S O N S of the OXFORD-CLERGY

A G A I N S T

A D D R E S S I N G.

S I R,

THE Copy you sent us of some Reasons for Addressing, with an Answer to 'em, and several Arguments against it drawn up by the Oxford-Clergy, doth most extreamly afflict and surprise us ; for, what Man of Sense could in the least imagine, that our Clergy, who once had obtain'd the highest Applauses for their Loyalty, should at last do any thing that may seem to justifie the Insinuations of those, who always said, That **Church-of-England-Loyalty** would continue no longer than the Prince was of their Religion : For *now* it looks as if our Loyalty must be no longer liv'd than our Church is in a Flourishing State ; why else do our Clergy thus *Remonstrate* against rendring His Majesty their humblest Thanks for the Assurances He has given 'em of Protection in

the Free Exercise of our Religion, and in the full Enjoyment of their Ecclesiastical Possessions? Don't they know, that they are owing to His Majesty's Grace for this much, and that, unless His Majesty had embrac'd that most Christian and Heroic Principle, That **Conscience ought not to be constrain'd**, and had also excell'd all his Royal Predecessors in Clemency, he could never forgive the Church of *England*, by whom so many Sanguinary Laws have been made against Men of His Religion; or, have forborn the Exercising that Prerogative in Matters Ecclesiastical, which our Church hath often recogniz'd to be Inherent in the Crown, and by which our Church may be in a great measure *Legally subverted*?

What then can be more manifest to a Person of the least Thoughtfulness, than that Our Church is infinitely oblig'd to His Majesty for Her present Standing? Or, what more certain, than that She is most disingenuously ungrateful, if She acknowledges not so much?

This Paper therefore, which is sent abroad on purpose to ensnare the Members of our Church, must not escape our Animadversions; and, that we may the more effectually prevent its design'd Mischief, we will lay down every Argument in the Words of the Paper, and endeavor that our discussing 'em may be with the greatest Evenness and Moderation.

In the First place then, we must make our Remarks on the Method taken to abuse the Reader, by proposing but Two Considerations, and that very lamely too, *for* Addressing; but as many more, with all the Advantages imaginable, *against* It; thereby tempting the Unwary to conclude, That the rending His Majesty their Thanks, was a thing most Ridiculous. However, we'll propose those feeble Arguments that are for

for Addressing, with the Clergys Answer, and try whether it's so easie a Matter to blow 'em off the Stage, as these Gentlemen would have us think.

Reasons for this Address may be Two.

FIRST, That it may continue His Majestys Favor; and the Omission may irritate the Treasury to demand a Review of the First-fruits, to the full Value, upon the Fifth Bond.

The C L E R G I E S ANSWER.

As to the King's Favor, if the known Loyal Principles and Practices of the Church of England, which evi- denc'd themselves (one would think) so acceptable to this Prince in the Instance of the Exclusion, and Mon- mouth, will not secure us, so not this Address (which only copies out Fanatical Loyalty and Gratitude) can con- tinue it.

Yet our Thanks at this time might not seem improper, if the Favor of continuing the Laws to us (which per- haps with all the Endeavors to the contrary cannot be Repeal'd) were as great as the Repealing those for the Dis- fenders Sake; which the Presbyterian and Independent Addresses say, His Majesty will engage His Parliament: to, and for which they principally give Thanks.

O U R R E P. L Y.

1. These Gentlemen think they have done enough already to merit the Continuance of His Majesty's Favor, because some of 'em were against the *Bill of Exclusion*,

Exclusion, and endeavor'd the Suppression of *Monmouth*; not considering, how many of our Communion were the Active Persons both in the Matter of the *Exclusion* and *Monmouth*. It's true, at that time some were very Loyal, and but some. Consult the late King's *Narrative*, and observe the Rise and Progress of that Conspiracy, and you will find, 'twas from First to Last begun and carried on by Church of *England* Men: For, tho the Fanatics had their Hand in it, yet they were not the Only, nor the Chief Actors. If you go back so far as the Excluding Parliament, they were, Five to One, Church of *England* Men. Or, if you look on the Contests about the Sheriffs, you will find the Church of *England* to be the Chief in that Transaction; and in truth, no one that had been a Dissenter, could act as a Sheriff or Common-Council-Man, until he had forsaken his Communion with the Dissenters, and incorporated himself with our Church: So that whatever they did in these Public Capacities, they did it not as Dissenters, but as Members of the Church of *England*. Come nearer home, to the late Rebellion, and consider who were the Heads of it, and 'twill appear, that they were of the Church of *England*: Or go down to *Winchester*, where were above Four hundred of the Meaneer sort, and, except Twenty or Thirty, all declare themselves to be of the Church of *England*: Or read *Julian*, a Church of *England* Divine, in which the Doctrin of *Non-resistance* is so much exploded, and you may soon be convinc'd, that the whole is said for Resistance, is only for the Encouragement of Church of *England* Men to fight in Defence of the Religion by Law Establish'd; not a Word to affect a Dissenter, whose Religion is by Statute-Laws condemn'd. So

So that our Church must take the Shame of all these things to her self, and confess, she has more reason to insist on his Majestie's *Grace*, than her own *Merit*, for the continuance of the King's Favour. But,

2. It is granted by these Gentlemen, That if the Favor of continuing the Laws to us were as great as the repealing those against the Dissenters, it might not be improper to give Thanks. So that its confess'd to be but just in the Dissenters to make their Addresses. And we doubt not but that we shall make it manifest, that such is the present State and Constitution of the Church of *England*, that it's as much in the Power of the King to humble our Clergy, as 'tis to comfort the Dissenter ; and that our Clergy are as much owing to the Kings Grace for the present exercise of their Religion, and Enjoyment of their Possessions, as the Dissenters are for the Indulgence. We mention not this to lessen his Majestie's Favor to the Dissenter, but that you may see the Transcendency of the Kings Grace to our Church.

The several Acts of Parliament recognizing the King's Supremacy in matters Ecclesiastical ; the *Doctrina* of the Church of *England* seen in her Articles, and the Histories of Queen *Elizabeth*, and King *James*, and *Charles* I. relating to this very thing, do sufficiently declare, that such is the Plenitude and Fulness, of the Kings Power in matters Ecclesiastical, that he can by his Ecclesiastical Commissioners make new Laws concerning Rights and Ceremonies, and impose new Articles on the Clergy, requiring their Subscription on pains of Suspension and Deprivation.

of Gods Glory, &c. Rex potest novas Leges condere circa Ceremonias & Ritus, cum Concilio Metropolitano vel Commissariorum in Causis Ecclesiasticis. Zouch. Descrip. Jur. Ecclesiast. par. 1. Sec. 2. Cosin. T. b. c. 1.

See. 1. Eliz.
c. 2. towards
the End. The
Queens Ma-
jesty, by the
Advice of her
Commissio-
ners or Me-
tropolitan,
may ordain
and publish
such Ceremo-
nies or Rites
as may be
most for the
Advancement

Before

Subscriptions
requir'd be-
fore the 13
Eliz. c. 12.
Heyl. Hist.
Q. Eliz. an.
5. pag. 331.

Before the 13. Eliz. c. 12. Subscriptions were en-
joyn'd by the Regal Power, and tho this Statute re-
quir'd Subscription, yet it being to the Articles of
Religion, which *only* concern the Confession of the
true Christian Faith, and the Doctrin of the
Sacraments, compriz'd in a Book Imprinted and
Entituled, *Articles, &c.* 'twas deemed by the Bi-
shops to be insufficient, who therefore apply them-
selves to their Prince, that by her Majesties Power
Ecclesiastical, they might enjoyn a fuller Subscription,
which, accordingly they did, appointing Subscription,

Not only the
Complaints of
the Nonconfor-
mists in their
Prints, but
our Histories
so frequently
mention it,
that 'twould
be trouble-
some to
quote 'em all.
We'll there-
fore, mention
what the Law-
yers say of it,
and it is
this, A Sub-
scription to
the 39 Arti-
cles, so far
forth, as the
Articles do
agree with
the *Law of*
God and the
Land, is not good, as was adjudged in 33 & 34 Eliz. B. R. Clark against Smithfield. So Godolph.
Abridg. Eccles. Laws. c. 13. §. 8. Besides the Canon 36. enjoyns this fuller Subscription,
That the King as Supream Head, may do whatever the Pope might formerly do with-
in this Realm by Canon Law, is asserted by all our Lawyers generally. See Coke 4.
Insti. 341. Cawley. 1. Q. Eliz. c. 1. Godolph. Abridg. c. 1. §. 5, 6, 7. Zouch. Descrip. jure
Eccles. p. 1. §. 1. Cofin. Tab. c. 16.

lities

lities, which cannot be held but by a Dispensation from the King, or at least by his confirming the Archbishops. And will any say, that tho the Dispensation, by which any of our Clergy hold their Pluralities, is deriv'd from the King, yet the King cannot revoke them? Or may not his Majesties Ecclesiastical Commissioners, make Enquiry after those who have above 8*l. per Annum*, and by a Dispensation hold a Second Benefice, and judge of the First Benefice, not according to the Value in the Kings Books, but according to the very Value of the Church, as has been formerly adjudged; or as is in the Argument for addressing, may not the Treasury demand a Review of the First Fruits according to the full Value? In a word, may not the King send out a *Quo Warranto* against the Bishops, and demand by what Power they hold Courts in their own Names, and finding nothing but Prescription to be their Plea, which can be no Bar against the King, sufficiently humble our Clergy? And, seeing his Majesty, notwithstanding the many Provocations he has met with, from some of our Clergy, is so far from Exercising this Power against our Church, that on the contrary he is so unexpressibly gracious as to promise his Protection, have we not the greatest Reason gratefully to acknowledge it to the King?

The Lord
C. J. Hobart
asserts, That
altho the Sta-
tute of 25.
Hen. 8. c. 21
doth say, That
all Dispensa-
tions, &c.
shall be
granted in
manner and
form follow-
ing, and not
otherwise, yet
the King is
not thereby
restrain'd,
but his Pow-
er remains
as full and
perfect as be-
fore. Col. and
Glover against
the Bishop of
Covent. and
Lichfield.
Godolph. A-
bridge. c. 26.
§. 12.
Nullum Tem-
pus occurrit
Regi.

Their affirming these Addresses to copy out only *Fanatical Loyalty*, and Gratitude, is so very indecent, that we think it unworthy of further Notice, judging their Confidence also about the Impossibility of Repealing their Laws to bear some Proportion to the Extravagance of their Censure.

The PAPER.

SECONDLY, That it seems our Duty to maintain Unity with our Bishop requiring it, and perhaps expecting it upon our Canonical Obedience, there being nothing preter licitum & honestum.

ANSWER.

As to the Bishop, 'tis conceiv'd, that this is no Instance of Canonical Obedience; nor is the Duty of our Unity with him apprehended to be such, as disunites us from the most, the best and soundest of the National Clergy, who we think ought not, and we believe will not move in an Affair, which concerns the whole Church equally without their Metropolitan and his Bishops. Neither hath our Bishop shewed any Pastoral Regard to us, unless it be in a treating us like Children in a very weak and passive Minority, by requiring our Submission to an Address formed and worded to our Hands, without our Knowledge, not leaving us the Liberty, and thinking us able to express the Sense of our Acts (or Hearts) and therefore till Bishops upon their Consecration declare what Faith they are of, as they did in the Primitive Church, for which the Reasons are the same as then; to maintain Unity with a Bishop without Caution is a Principle, that may lead us further than we ought to go.

REPLY.

1. There being so much Reason why our Clergy ought to make their Address of Thanks to the King,
it

it would be very strange if such a Practice cannot be found amongst the *Licita* and *Honestia* of our Church ; and if it comes within this Pale, and the Ordinary commands it, it's beyond us to conceive how Disobedience in the Clergy can escape the Guilt of Perjury. For the Oath express'd in the Instrument of the Clergies Institution is in these words, *Te Primus de legitima & Canonica Obedientia nobis & Successoribus nostris, in omnibus licitis & honestis Mandatis per te praestanda & exhibenda, ad Sancta Evangelia ritè juratum admittimus.* So that they are sworn to perform Lawful and Canonical Obedience to their Ordinary in all his lawful and honest *Mandates*. The Bishop then commands 'em to thank the King for his Grace and Clemency in a matter for which once heretofore they did it. Is this Lawful or Unlawful ? Honest or Dishonest ? Not Unlawful nor Dishonest ; because when the King declared *only* to the Council he would protect the Church of *England*, they then judg'd it their Duty ; now the King doth but make the same Declaration to the whole Kingdom, and if not Unlawful, and their Ordinary commands it, they are bound by their Oath to obey, how then can they disobey and not be at least forsworn ? But,

2. How comes it to pass, that their Obeying their Ordinary disunites 'em from the most, the best and soundest of the National Clergy ? What ! are the whole Clergy so insensible of the Kings Grace, that they'll not acknowledge it ? what a prodigious Change is this ? And why must they not rather regard their own Ordinary, than the Sense of others ? If the matter requir'd, be (as we have prov'd it to be) Lawful and Honest, do they make nothing of an Oath ? and is Church-of *England* Unity in danger of

being broken? That surely is ominous, and no doubt will open the Mouth both of Papist and Protestant Dissenter. Is the Church of *Englands* Case so desperate, that they must either be ungrateful to their Prince, or be divided amongst themselves? Furthermore,

They declare, 3. *Their Bishop shews no Pastoral Regard to 'em, unless it be in treating 'em like Children, by requiring their Submission to an Address worded to their Hands, not leaving 'em the Liberty to express the Sense of their Hearts.* So the Paper. And what hurt in all this? It's containeth nothing in it to be presum'd, they'll make more bold with their Prince than with God; and therefore seeing they are contrary to the Word of God, and that it may be lawfully used, and that they will use the Form in the said Book prescribed, in Publick Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and *none other. Can.*

36. Art. 2. 4. *Bishops upon their Consecration should declare what Faith they are of, as they did in the Primitive Times.* What's this but too high a Reflection upon our Church, an Accusation that we are fallen from the Primitive Purity? Tho it must be acknowledg'd, that all the Clergy Subscribe, Assent, and Consent to the Thirty nine Articles, &c. And is not that enough? Or, have they forgotten how solemnly they did swear Canonical Obedience to their Ordinary; that they now tell us, they must maintain Unity with their Bishop with *Caution*; thereby encouraging even the Nonconformists in their Dissent?

But to the Arguments against Addressing.

THE PAPER.

Reasons against it are Many; under the present Circumstances, to instance in Four.

FIRST, As to our Possessions, it either equally concerns all Estates of Men in the Kingdom, and ought then to be most particularly consider'd in Parliament; or, it supposes our Possessions less Legal, and more Arbitrary than other Subjects.

A N S W E R.

As for their Possessions, they are settled on them in no other manner than they were on the Clergy in Q. Elizabeth's and K. James the First's Days, when, for not subscribing to Articles never then enjoyn'd by Act of Parliament, many hundreds of the Clergy were suspended, and depriv'd of all their Ecclesiastical Possessions: And should a strict Enquiry be made into our Clergy, it's to be fear'd, that too many of 'em would be found so very guilty, as to deserve not only a Suspension, but also a Deprivation; and we therefore cannot think it to be the Wisdom of our Clergy to provoke the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to make a close Search after their Miscarriages, especially seeing Deprivations have been anciently for Dilapidations, and such like Offences.

AR-

ARGUMENT II.

SECONDLY, As to our Religion, This Address (referring to the Declaration) necessarily herds among the various Sects under the Toleration, who for suspending the Laws have led the way in these Addresses, owing their Exercise of their Religion to no Legal Establishment, but only to Sovereign Pleasure and Indulgence, which at pleasure is revocable.

ANSWER.

1. They'll not deny, but that they now agree with the other Sects, in Dissenting from his Majesty's Religion, and are equally with them owing to the King's Grace, and His most Christian Principle, *That Conscience ought not to be constrain'd*, for the Protection the King vouchsafes them in the Enjoyment of the Free Exercise of our Religion. They see how easily the King can humble them; and had he not been for Liberty of Conscience, he must esteem himself under the most powerful Obligations of endeavoring it, and a Change of our Religion: Why then should they be so much against concurring with the various Sects among us in rendering the King their Thanks? What, shall the Fanatic out-do us in point of Ingenuity and Gratitude?

2. They say, *That the Dissenters owe the Exercise of their Religion to no Legal Establishment, but only to Sovereign Pleasure.*

What a strange Change is this! The other day, in the late King's Reign, the Cry, the General Cry was, That the very *Legislative Power* was lodg'd in the Breast of

of the King; but now, contrary to the very *Vitals* of ^{If an Act of} our Government, they'll not allow Him the entire En- ^{Parliament} joyment of the *Executive Power*. That the King may ^{forbiddeth un-} grant a Dispensation with a *Non obstante* to any Act of ^{der a Penalty,} Parliament, as well as give out a Particular Pardon to ^{and it prove} divers par- ^{inconveni-} the Transgressors of any Statute, and these particular ^{toicular Per-} Dispensations and Pardons may be given out to every ^{sions, the Law} particular Subject that needs 'em, has been the ^{gives Power} to the King to avow'd Principle even of the greatest Opposers of ^{to dispense} Arbitr ary Government. Besides, in Matters Ecclesi- ^{therewith. So} astical, which comprehend the Dissenters Case, the ^{Rolls and coke.} Sovereignty of the King is as full and compleat, as ^{See 22 Car. 2.} any of His Majesty's Royal Predecessors, and theirs the ^{The Author} same with that Power the Popes did *de facto* exercise ^{of Jovian al-} according to *Canon-Law*, with a *Non obstante* to a par- ^{sures us, That} ticular Act of Parliament. <sup>the Govern-
ment of this
Kingdom con-
fists in the Im-
perial as well</sup>

But what need we insist on these things? Have not <sup>as the Politi-
cal Laws; and</sup> the *Clergy* gone higher in exalting the Sovereign Plea- ^{whatever is} sure above all Laws, even in *Civils*, when in the Decla- ^{requit'd by the} ration that all our *Clergy* subscribe, they distinguish ^{Imperial Laws,} between the Sovereign Pleasure of our King, and His <sup>if not contra-
ry to the Laws</sup> Authority or Law; and that the Law or Authority, of God, must ^{of, God, must} if it at any time falls in competition with the Sov- ^{be observ'd:} reign Pleasure, must defer to Sovereign Pleasure; it ^{So that unless} being a Trayterous Practice to observe the Law, in <sup>Acts of Parli-
ament be jure
divino, and the</sup> opposition to any Commission'd by Sovereign Power? ^{Imperial Law,} ^{or the Word} ^{of the King is} <sup>to act contra-
ry, we must ob-
ey. Jovian.</sup>

The PAPER.

THIRDLY, This Address is either design'd in <sup>Edit. 2. p. 205.
206.</sup> the Name of the Church of England, and then ^{205.} it ought to have had 'its Birth at Lambeth, or ^{206.} a Synodal Convocation, or in the Name of this ^{one.} Diocels only, which then will both disjoyn us.

one from another who differ about it, or from the rest of the National Clergy; the best part of which we are assur'd dislike it in the present Circumstances: So that the inevitable Consequence of this Address (set on foot by a few Bishops independently on their Metropolitan, and without the previous Concurrence of the rest of their Order) must be a fatal Division among the Clergy, and either beget a new Schism, or widen the old ones, which, are already too deplorable.

A N S W E R.

One would think that the Bishop and Clergy of a Diocese might safely enough make their Addres of Thanks to the King, without the previous Concurrence of the rest of their Order, or consulting their Metropolitan. For the Union between Bishop and Bishop, and the Dependance of all the Bishops in a Province on their Metropolitan, ought to be comprehended within those matters, that relate to Purity of Faith and Manners; but is Non-addressing a matter of Faith, or Addressing, contrary to the Rule of good Manners, that it must not be adventur'd on without the Advice of a Colledge of Bishops, or the leave of a Metropolitan? But if we do more closely pursue this point, we shall find the Constitution of our Church to be such, that in all matters of *Consultation*, the Birth must not be at *Lambeth*, but at *Whitehall*. For what Power Superior to a single Bishop hath the Metropolitan, but what is *Juris positivi*, and derived from the King, the Fountain and Source of all Provincial and National Church-Power in these Kingdoms? This surely must be granted by those that are not for a Power deriv'd, either

either from a General Council, or from the Roman Pontif, and then it will inevitably follow, that his Majesty in the first place is to be consulted, whose Mind in this matter is sufficiently known, and it's as much the Duty of the Metropolitan to consult and obey the King the Supreme Ordinary of this National Church, as it can be for a single Bishop to regard his Metropolitan ; for which Reason we think it a Presumption, very near to what is unpardonable in the Inferior Clergy, to dispute what is agreeable to the Sense, both of their Ordinary, and Supreme Ordinary.

*Synodus Pro-
vincialis vel
Nationalis con-
vocari non de-
bet absque Prin-
cipis Reforatio :
nec tradiari, nec
determinari a-
liquid potest in
Synodo, nisi con-
sentiente & af-
fidente Prin-
cipe. Cosin.
Tab. c. 1.*

And as for the Talk of Schism, as if these, who are for Addressing, must needs be *Schismatics* ; we only say, that making Differences about matters of this nature to be Schismatical, will tempt thoughtful Men to conclude, that the Outcries of Schism against the Non-conformists, have been grounded on as little Reason, and with as little Justice.

The P A P E R.

FOURTHLY, It will forfeit our Reputation with the Nobility, Gentry and Commonalty of our Communion, and may tempt them to Disgust us for our rash Compliance with suspected Artifices (which may rise hereafter against us, to our Own, and the Church's Prejudice) and to waver in the Stedfastness of their own Profession, when they see us owning the Exercise of our Established Religion to be so precarious.

C. in folio. A. N.

A N S W E R.

Above Twenty Years together without any Regard to the Nobility, Gentry and Commonalty, our Clergy have been publishing to the World, that the King can do greater things than are done in his Declaration. But now the Scene is alter'd, and they are become more concern'd to maintain their Reputation, even with the Commonalty, than with the King: Ay, they Insinuate as if the Nobility and Gentry had taken up their Religion on such a Foundation, as would be shaken by an Address; and do moreover suggest, as if the Nobility and Gentry are as little affected with his Majesties Grace as themselves.

The P A P E R.

May it not therefore be expedient, humbly to Remonstrat our Scruples in this Affair to our Diocesan, and beseech him not to require our Act, without consulting us in a thing of so Public and National Concernment, wherein we conceive our selves oblig'd to proceed upon mature Deliberation, and united Measures, which under God and the King, are like to be our greatest Safeguard?

A N S W E R.

Their Duty is to consider, whether they are more oblig'd to their Metropolitan, than to their Diocesan. If they ought to regard their Diocesan most, it's their Duty to submit unto his Sense of things, and not revive

vive the old way of *Remonstrating* thus; but if they judge themselves bound to regard their Metropolitan more than their Diocesan, we are sure that their Obligation to the King, the Supreme Ordinary of the Church of *England*, is much greater, and that they ought not to bring what he approves of under debate, especially considering the Transcendency of His Majesty's Favor towards them, and that such Discoveries of Ingratitude may justly provoke the King to exercise His Just Prerogatives in Matters Ecclesiastical, and humble them.

In a word, we would, if possible, inculcate this on your Thoughts, That our Church of *England* Lawyers have resolutely affirm'd the King to be Supreme Ordinary, and by the ancient Laws of this Realm, may without any Act of Parliament make Ordinances and Institutions See *Cawley* on for the Goverment of the Clergy, and may deprive them if ¹ Eliz. c. 1. they obey not. *Moor* 755. C. 1043. *Cro. Trin.* 2 *Jac.* 37. *Cawley* 1 *Eliz.* c. 1. And when the Prince zealously espous'd our Churches Quarrel, 'twas deem'd by our Clergy to be almost Treason to suggest the contrary: And if you consult our Histories, you'll see, that Queen *Elizabeth*, in favor of our Clergy, did many a time exercise this Power; on her entring the Throne, she sent out a *Proclamation*, That no Man (of what Perswasion soever he was in the Points of Religion) should be suffered to Preach in public, but only such as should be licens'd by her Authority: On which occasion no Sermon was preach'd at *Paul's Cross*, or any public place of ^{Heylyn's Hist.} ^{Q. Eliz.} ^{p. 276.} in *London*, from *December* until the *Easter* following; and by it, those that could not subscribe the Articles enjoyn'd meerly by Regal Power, were suspended and depriv'd: Whence we observe, That if this Power be inherent in the Imperial Crown of *England*, as hitherto

to our *Clergy*, in opposition to Fanatic Clamors, have over and over asserted, the *Clergy* are undoubtedly owing to His Majesty's Clemency for the free exercise of their Religion; for had not the King excell'd Queen Elizabeth of precious Memory, in Compassion and Grace, their Mouths would have been stopp'd long ago: On the other hand, if this Power be not inherent in the Crown, 'twill inevitably follow, That the Nonconformists have been most unjustly treated by our *Clergy*. To conclude, The last Result will be this; Our *Clergy* must abide by their old avowal, Doctrin, defend the King's Ecclesiastical Supremacy, and acknowledge, that it is to His Majesty's Grace they are owing for their present Liberty; or condemn all their former Practices against the Dissenter, and turn over unto them: *Utrum horum*. Farewell.

F I N I S.

302227